

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 30, 2001 LB 543

its peer group; University of Nebraska at Omaha ranks ninth in its peer group on faculty salaries. Faculty salaries are very competitive, as you probably well know. A strong university in any state is very important to its economic development, particularly I think in rural development. There are some initiatives that the university has proposed to which we did not fund in its entirety, by the way, but we did do at least a third of that amount for a rural initiative, a rural economic development initiative. But I think \$10 million is...is a very hefty cut for the University of Nebraska budget. I'm not quite clear as to why it does go to the community colleges. That is not a significant property tax relief, if that's the purpose of that. Community colleges really haven't asked for that money, if that's the purpose of that. So I'm not clear as to whether there's a rationale for cutting the university simply to go to the community colleges or whatever reason that is. But I would urge the body not to seriously consider this at all. I believe it's important to keep the university on track to a strong university system, to an adequate salary compensation, which is part of...of this package. I know it's also part of the tuition package. I have a handout, that I will handout if...if it's appropriate here in due time, of a speech that President Smith, in this case, gave about the importance of...of these important issues that Nebraska university faces at all...at all levels of...all systems. So, I just want to simply say I oppose this. I have to hear a better rationale for the reason for cutting. I'm not sure it's all come out by Senator Erdman. I see he's looking really to see what a squid and an octopus...what family that belongs to. So, with that, I'm going to quit. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Kristensen, on the Erdman amendment.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose this amendment for two reasons. The first one is from the point of view of the community college system. What will happen here is that if you put \$10 million into that formula you're going to cause the community college system a great deal of grief that they're already...they already have some grief by taking the \$30 million out. But that is easy in one year to say, look, here's the reason for the change,